Dynamics beyond the jamming density - The unjamming of self-propelled particles

Ruben van Drongelen[1] and Timon Idema[1]

[1] *Delft University of Technology, Department of Bionanoscience, Kavli Institute of Nanoscience - van der Maasweg 9, Delft*

arXiv:1611.09125v1 [cond-mat.soft] 28 Nov 2016

PACS 64.70.D- – Solid-liquid transitions
PACS 64.70.qj – Dynamics and criticality
PACS 87.18.Tt – Noise in biological complex systems

Abstract
Many biological systems form colonies at high density. Passive granular systems will be jammed at such densities, yet for the survival of biological systems it is crucial that they are dynamic. We construct a jamming phase diagram for a system of active, aligning particles, varying the density, self-propulsion speed and the competition between alignment and orientational noise. Our simulations reveal that there exists an optimal ratio between alignment and noise, such that particles require a minimal force to unjam and therefore allow for rearrangements.

Introduction

Organisms often search for the safety of large numbers, hence many biological systems consist of collections of many individuals. Examples range over many scales, including herds of mammals, flocks of birds, bacterial colonies, and tissues. Such biological systems are intrinsically out of equilibrium. For example, constituents can use their internal energy to propel themselves. One of the earliest attempts to model such a system uses self-propelled particles to describe the flocking behaviour of birds [1]. Since then, many more variants of self-propelled particle models have emerged [2]. In some cases, like flocks of birds, the agents can be modelled as point particles. In contrast, for bacterial colonies and tissues, the density is so high that the bacteria or cells are in physical contact with each other. These systems often have such a high density that they risk becoming jammed. Nonetheless, the constituents rely heavily on rearrangements for their survival. These observations lead us to the following questions: how do colonies prevent jamming in the first place and what are the limits on the density in the colony and the forces that its members generate?

Parallel to self-propelled particle models, granular soft materials gained a lot of interest over the last two decades. Granular materials have the property that they can behave as a solid and as a liquid, depending on the density, temperature and load. In 1998, Liu and Nagel [3] first sketched a qualitative picture of jammed states and their transitions to unjamming. Three years later, Van Trappe et al. [4] improved this phase diagram. Since then, many have investigated granular phase transitions by looking into the effects of density [5,6], temperature [7], and shear forces [8,9]. A similar jamming transition was also found in confluent tissues in both experiments [10], and simulations [11,12], where a tissue was modelled as as a Voronoi tessellation.

Dense active systems, like granular materials, also often consist of roughly identical individuals or particles and therefore combining models from both fields is a logical step. There are many possible combinations that could be made. For example one could consider finite size self-propelled particles without alignment [13–16], alignment with the instantaneous velocity [17, 18], alignment with nearest neighbours [19], or even a combination of Vicsek alignment and velocity alignment [20].

So far, the studies that use Vicsek alignment have focussed on the rich dynamics. In this letter we focus on the very thing that these active systems are trying to prevent: jamming. We classify jamming based on an internal diffusion coefficient that represents the ability to rearrange. We investigate the effect that self-propulsion and alignment in combination with noise have on the jamming transition, at densities well above the classical jamming density. Our simulations indicate that at high density, systems require

both alignment with neighbours and orientational noise to unjam. Our results show that there exists an optimal competition between alignment and noise such that particles require a minimal self-propulsion force to unjam.

Model system

We placed N soft, self-propelled particles in a square with double periodic boundary conditions. The radii of the particles are drawn from a Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu = \bar{a}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = \bar{a}/10$. The variation in radii prevents artificial crystallisation effects. We want to model systems in the regime where viscous forces dominate over inertial forces, e.g. bacteria or other unicellular organisms and cell tissues. Therefore, the dynamics of the particles are over-damped and the equation of motion is given by Stokes' law:

$$\vec{F}_i = \zeta \vec{v}_i. \tag{1}$$

In eq. 1, $\vec{F}_i$ denotes the total force exerted on particle i. This force results in an instantaneous velocity $\vec{v}_i$ of the particle. The proportionality constant ζ depends the viscosity η and the particle's radius a_i and is given by $\zeta = 6\pi\eta a_i$ or $\zeta = (32/3)\eta a_i$, in three and two dimensions respectively. The total force on the particle is the sum of steric repulsion forces with all particles j that generate overlap, $\vec{F}_{\mathrm{rep},j}$, and a self-propulsion force, $\vec{F}_{\mathrm{sp}}$. We choose a simple harmonic repulsion, such that the force is proportional to, and in the direction of the linear overlap $\vec{d}_{ij}$. Hence, the total force becomes

$$\vec{F}_i = \sum_j \vec{F}_{\mathrm{rep}} + \vec{F}_{\mathrm{sp}} = \sum_j k\vec{d}_{ij} + F_{\mathrm{sp}}\frac{a_i}{\bar{a}}\hat{\psi}_i, \tag{2}$$

$$\vec{F}_i = \sum_j k\vec{d}_{ij} + \lambda_s k a_i \hat{\psi}_i, \tag{3}$$

where k is the spring constant for the repulsive term and F_{sp} sets the magnitude of the self-propulsion force. Any particle i propels itself along an intrinsic unit vector $\hat{\psi}_i$, which we will refer to as the orientation of particle i. We choose the self-propulsion force to be proportional to the particle's size, such that the speed of differently sized particles would be the same in the absence of pairwise interaction. In eq. 3 we use that we can rescale all forces by $k\bar{a}$, which follows naturally from the repulsion term. Next, we define the dimensionless parameter $\lambda_s = F_{\mathrm{sp}}/k\bar{a}$ to set the strength of the self-propulsion in our simulations.

Two competing effects regulate the orientation of a particle. On the one hand, particles want to align with a local director, while on the other hand, they are subject to an orientational noise. In our model, the orientation is governed by

$$\hat{\psi}_i = \mathrm{Rot}(\theta)\frac{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\hat{\psi}_j}{\left|\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\hat{\psi}_j\right|}. \tag{4}$$

Here, $\mathrm{Rot}(\theta)$ is the 2D rotation matrix, that rotates a vector by an angle θ. We draw the rotation angle θ from a uniform distribution between $-\lambda_n\pi$ and $\lambda_n\pi$, where we set λ_n between zero (low noise) and one (high noise). We define $\mathcal{N}_i$ to be the set of particles in the neighbourhood of particle i. A particle is in the neighbourhood of particle i if its distance to particle i is smaller than $2.8\bar{a}$. We choose this distance such that two neighbouring large particles will still be considered neighbours, whereas two small particles separated by a third will not.

The Vicsek order parameter quantifies the competition between alignment and orientational noise. It is defined as

$$\phi = \frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{\psi}_i\right|. \tag{5}$$

The order parameter equals unity for perfect alignment between all particles and is close to zero when the direction of all particles are uncorrelated from those of their neighbours.

Note that the noise term is exclusively orientational. This noise term is an essential competing effect to the alignment for dynamics in the system. We choose not to include a noise term in the force equation to have a minimal system that displays the dynamics we want to study. Another choice we made is to have an equation regulate the orientations of the particles directly instead of a rotational analogue of the force equation (eq. 3). We do so because the jamming transition naturally comes with a dramatic slow down of the dynamics and diverging time scales. An accurate description of a system at high noise would require infeasibly many simulation steps for the orientation of a particle to decorrelate. Instead, we choose to use an update mechanism for the orientation identical to the mechanism used in the original Vicsek model.

Results

We simulate $N = 1024$ particles in a box of size $L \times L$, where we calculate L from the imposed dimensionless packing fraction $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\pi a_i^2/L^2$. All distances are in units of the average particle radius $\bar{a} = 1$ and we set the force scale by choosing $k = 1$ for our simulations. Our unit of time is set by the relaxation time of the repulsive interaction $\tau = \zeta/k = 1$. We adjust the number of simulation steps per unit time such that the displacement by the self-propulsion force is 1/1000th of the average particle radius, $\bar{a}$. Simulations run for a total of 10^8 steps. The parameters that we vary are the packing fraction, the self-propulsion speed of the particles and the size of the interval from which we draw a random angle that causes noise on the alignment.

Phase diagram of jamming

We characterize solid-like or liquid-like behaviour by taking a direct measure of the motion in our system. Note however that a system of perfect alignment can move collectively, but lacks any rearrangements and the motion is just a translation of the centre of mass. In an infinite system, or a system with periodic boundary conditions, this

global translation is meaningless and such a system should still be characterized as jammed. We therefore look at rearrangements or the displacement of the particles with respect to a reference point that moves with the system. We take as this reference point the average position of all particles after thermalisation. To identify rearrangements in the system we calculate the mean squared displacement (MSD) of all particles with respect to this average position. The diffusion coefficient does not indicate Brownian motion, because the displacement of the particle is not the result from a conversion of heat into kinetic energy, but a consequence of the activity of the particles.

In a jammed system, particles will not be able to travel more than a distance $\bar{a}$ because they are obstructed by their neighbours. This effect is known as caging and is visible in the mean squared displacement as a plateau. Particles in unjammed systems do not have this restriction, and we can assign a diffusion coefficient, D, to the linear behaviour of the MSD after the particle has escaped its cage. We consider our system to be jammed if the MSD reaches a plateau at $\mathrm{MSD}(t) < \bar{a}^2$ or if the fitted diffusion constant does not allow for displacements larger than $\bar{a}$ during our measurement of the MSD.

With the classical jamming transition at $\rho_c = 0.843$ [21], we ran simulations at three different densities ($\rho \in \{0.845, 0.860, 0.900\}$). We varied the self propulsion force over two orders of magnitude ($\lambda_s \in \{0.003, 0.01, 0.03, 0.10, 0.30\}$) and we used six different values for the orientational noise ($\lambda_n \in \{0.01, 0.10, 0.30, 0.40, 0.50, 0.60, 1.00\}$). At $\lambda_n = 0.00$, the particles align perfectly without any noise, whereas at $\lambda_n = 1.00$, the particles reorient themselves in a random direction every single simulation step. Therefore, particles do not align and cannot move collectively. On top of that, the particles have a vanishing persistence length compared to their radius.

Conventional jamming phase diagrams have density, temperature and load on their axes, following Liu and Nagel [3]. We replace the temperature axis by self-propulsion force, and load by orientational noise. Although temperature and particle activity initially seem very similar, their nature is completely different. For example, for active matter, the fluctuation dissipation theorem does not hold. Consequently, our phase diagram in fig. 1a looks very distinct from earlier jamming phase diagrams. The surface in our diagram separates the jammed systems (below the surface) from the unjammed ones (above the surface). Hence the surface can be thought of as an indication of how much activity the particles need to unjam the system. Figs. 1b and c are heatmaps of the diffusion coefficient corresponding to the $\lambda_n = 0.30$-slice and the $\rho = 0.90$-slice in the phase diagram respectively. We set the diffusion coefficient for jammed systems to 10^{-8}, such that they are represented by a red colour in the heatmap. The gradient is a linear interpolation of $\log(D)$ between the simulations (black dots) and the dashed line indicates the intersection with the surface. We find unjammed systems even at densities far exceeding the jamming density as long as



Figure 1: a) Phase diagram of jamming as a function of density ρ, self-propulsion λ_s, and angular noise λ_n, based upon the value of $\log(D)$. The surface separates the jammed states (below) from the unjammed states (above). We find that even at densities far exceeding the jamming density, systems can still unjam. The valley implies an optimal noise for unjamming. We make slices in the phase diagram at b) constant noise ($\lambda_n = 0.30$) and c) constant density ($\rho = 0.90$). The colour gradient indicates the value of the log of the diffusion coefficient. The dashed curve corresponds to the intersection with the surface of the phase diagram in a). b) As expected, particles need more activity to unjam at higher densities. c) Surprisingly, too much noise causes the system to jam. Instead we find an optimal noise for the system to unjam at minimal self-propulsion. d) Same as c), but zoomed in to the region where we observe an optimal transition between the jammed state and the unjammed state (green dashed rectangle). We find an optimum around $\lambda_n = 0.50$.

the particles exert a sufficiently large self-propulsion force. Just as we expected, the higher the density is, the larger this force needs to be. Interestingly, the $\rho = 0.90$-slice in the phase diagram in fig. 1c shows that the system can go from jammed, to unjammed and back to jammed along the noise axis. Since this noise is only on the orientation of the particles, and not on its translation, more noise does not automatically mean that the system is more likely to unjam. In fact, particles lose their orientational persistence for too much noise. They cannot push aside their neighbours and therefore will always be trapped between the same set of particles. On the other hand, too little noise causes particles to move in the same direction as their neighbours. This situation is similar to a traffic jam, where you can have a global translation, but locally the cars cannot overtake, i.e. their cage travels with them. Therefore, we expect an optimal noise where particles require a minimal self-propulsion force to unjam. The nature of our optimal noise is different than the optima reported by Reichardt and Chepizhko [22, 23]. In both references they



Figure 2: Dependence of the Vicsek order parameter ϕ on orientational noise λ_n for $N = 16,384$ particles at $\rho = 0.90$ and averaged over all simulated values of λ_s. The data in a) suggests a critical point near $\lambda_n = 0.5$. Consequently, we fitted a powerlaw (dashed line): $\phi \sim (\lambda_c - \lambda_n)^\nu$, with $\lambda_c = 0.534 \pm 0.003$ and $\nu = 0.40 \pm 0.01$. In figure b) we plot ϕ versus $\lambda_c - \lambda_n$ on a log-log scale and find that the data indeed falls on a straight line.

find maximized motility of a cluster by optimizing the run-and-tumble frequency or angular noise respectively. Our optimal noise maximizes the motility of particles within clusters.

To find a more precise estimate of the optimal noise, we ran additional simulations for nine values of λ_n regularly spaced between $0.35 < \lambda_n < 0.55$ and eight values of λ_s, on regular intervals between $0.03 < \lambda_s < 0.10$. We find that for $\lambda_{n,\mathrm{opt}} \approx 0.5$, particles require a minimal self-propulsion force to overcome jamming (see fig. 1d). This value is surprisingly high, considering that at each simulation step, a random angle is drawn from a uniform distribution on the interval $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. However, this random angle is added to the average orientation of the neighbourhood around a particle every simulation step. Therefore, a particle retains a longer persistent length than you might intuitively expect at this noise level.

Critical behaviour

The optimal noise, $\lambda_{n,\mathrm{opt}}$, we found in the phase diagram indicates an interesting competition between the alignment and noise. Fig. 2 shows the relation between the noise parameter λ_n and the Vicsek order parameter defined in eq. 5. On a linear scale (fig. 2a), the order vanishes above a critical noise. Motivated by the existence of a critical point, we fit a powerlaw of the form $\phi \sim (\lambda_c - \lambda_n)^\nu$. The dashed line corresponds to a fit with $\lambda_c = 0.534 \pm 0.003$ and $\nu = 0.40 \pm 0.01$. In fig. 2b we plot the same data on a $\log - \log$-scale. The critical point and exponent we find for finite sized particles are fully consistent with the work by Czirok et al. [24] on point-like particles.

In an infinite system, the order parameter has to vanish at high noise. To verify that this is indeed the case, we simulated larger systems with $N = 16,384$ particles. We found that for these systems, the tail near the critical point is less pronounced than it is for $N = 1024$ particles, which is also an indication of the existence of a critical point. This behaviour is reminiscent of a second order phase transition in equilibrium systems. Although phase transitions are equilibrium phenomena, it is widely expected that phase transitions also occur in out-of-equilibrium systems. For example, Flenner et al. [15] recently showed that the glass transition in systems of active, but non-aligning particles has a lot of similarities with the glass transition in thermal systems.

The rotational part of our model appears to be very similar to the well-studied xy-model. The xy-model is a description for spins on a lattice that can rotate in a plane. A Hamiltonian aligns the spins of neighbouring sites. The model has a critical temperature where the order parameter vanishes. However, our simple uniform noise term is of different physical origin than the noise term in the xy-model. As a result, our critical noise parameter cannot be compared quantitatively to the critical temperature.

The critical noise parameter at $\lambda_c = 0.534$ is only slightly larger than the optimal noise $0.475 < \lambda_{n,\mathrm{opt}} < 0.525$ for unjamming. Of course, at the critical point, any orientational correlation between particles vanishes. Therefore the critical noise λ_c serves as an upper bound for the optimal noise.

Conclusion

We simulated self-propelled particles at densities exceeding the classical jamming density. We constructed a 3D phase diagram distinguishing jammed and unjammed packings by varying the density, self-propulsion speed and orientational noise of the particles. Systems require a combination of alignment and orientational noise to unjam. Too little noise causes all particles to align, and particles will be stuck between their neighbours like in a traffic jam. Too much noise causes the particles to change direction so quickly that they lack the ability to push aside their neighbours. Once again, the particles become trapped in a cage formed by their neighbours. The optimal competition between alignment and noise occurs at $\lambda_{n,\mathrm{opt}} \approx 0.5$. The orientation of the particles then deviates up to 0.5π from the average direction around them. With a minimal self-propulsion force, the particles are able to create local differences in density. Consequently, rearrangements can occur in the low density regions, ultimately responsible for long-time mixing.

We measure the competition between alignment and noise with the Vicsek order parameter. The transition between the ordered state ($\phi \neq 0$) and the disordered state ($\phi = 0$) reminds us of a second order phase transition with a critical noise at $\lambda_c = 0.534$. The critical noise serves as an absolute upper bound for the optimal noise. To allow for dynamics in large groups, particles should choose their noise just below the critical noise.

* * *

This work was supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO/OCW), as part of the Frontiers of Nanoscience program.

References

[1] Vicsek T., Czirók A., Ben-Jacob E., Cohen I. and Shochet O., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **75** (1995) 1226
[2] Vicsek T. and Zafeiris A., *Phys. Rep.*, **517** (2012) 71
[3] Liu A. J. and Nagel S. R., *Nature*, **396** (1998) 21
[4] Trappe V., Prasad V., Cipelletti, L., Segre P. N. and Weitz D. A., *Nature*, **411** (2001) 772
[5] O'Hern C. S., Langer S. A., Liu A. J. and Nagel S. R., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **88** (2002) 075507
[6] Bolintineanu D. S., Grest G. S., Lechman J. B. and Silbert L. E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **115** (2015) 088002
[7] Zhang Z., Xu N., Chen D. T. N., Yunker P., Alsayed A. M., Aptowicz K. B., Habdas P., Liu A. J., Nagel S. R. and Yodh A. G., *Nature*, **459** (2009) 230
[8] Tighe B. P., Woldhuis E., Remmers J. J. C., van Saarloos W. and van Hecke M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **105** (2010) 088303
[9] Vågberg D., Olsson P. and Teitel S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **113** (2014) 148002
[10] Angelini T. E., Hannezo E., Trepat. X., Marquez M. Fredberg J. J. and Weitz D. A., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **108** (2011) 4714
[11] Bi D., Lopez J. H., Schwarz J. M., and Manning M. L., *Nature Physics*, **11** (2015) 1074
[12] Bi D., Yang X., Marchetti M. C., and Manning M. L., *Phys. Rev. X*, **6** (2016) 021011
[13] Fily Y., Henkes S. and Marchetti M. C., *Soft Matter*, **10** (2014) 2132
[14] Wysocki A., Winkler, R. G. and Gompper G., *EPL*, **105** (2014) 48004
[15] Flenner E., Szamel G. and Berthier L., *Soft Matter*, **12** (2016) 7136
[16] Bialké J., Speck T., and Löwen H., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **108** (2012) 168301
[17] Henkes S., Fily Y., and Marchetti M. C., *Phys. Rev. E*, **84** (2011) 040301
[18] Sknepnek R. and Henkes S., *Phys. Rev. E*, **91** (2015) 022306
[19] van Drongelen R., Pal A., Goodrich C. P. and Idema T., *Phys. Rev. E*, **91** (2015) 032706
[20] Weber C. A., Bock, C. and Frey, E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **112** (2014) 168301
[21] Vågberg D., Olsson P. and Teitel S., *Phys. Rev. E*, **93** (2016) 052902
[22] Reichhardt C. and Olson Reichhardt C. J., *Phys. Rev. E*, **90** (2014) 012701
[23] Chepizhko O., Altmann E. G., and Peruani F., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110** (2013) 238101
[24] Czirók A., Stanley H. E. and Vicsek T., *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.*, **30** (1997) 1375